

REMARKS

Applicant has addressed the section 112 issues through the amendment above.

The Examiner asserts Sahr (USP 6,286,448) in combination with Khan (USP 6,280,178) under § 103 against claims 1-30. Sahr discloses a boat hull with an insert having a top and bottom to define an interior foam chamber that is formed via an injection molding process. Khan discloses an injection molding apparatus for producing molded millwork products. Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Sahr and Kahn does not teach all of the claimed elements.

Specifically, the Examiner relies upon Sahr to teach a molding process using an open face mold citing column 4, lines 17-43 and column 5, lines 49-54. Column 4, however, actually recites "two open face molds 72 and 74 clamped together [and] foam is preferably injected into the foam chambers." Column 5 further discloses two molds that come together to form a closed system for injection molding. Likewise, column 9 of Khan, as relied upon by the Examiner, discloses upper and lower mold parts that "are mated together so as to place the lower and upper portions 52A, 52B of the mold cavity 52 in the closed condition, as seen in Figs. 3, 5 and 6." Col. 9, ll. 11-15. The pending claims, however, are all directed to a screed mold process, which is quite different from the closed systems of injection molding as disclosed in the cited art. Screed molds utilize an open, non-pressurized molding system. Whereas, injection molding is a closed system under pressure. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 16, from which all of the remaining pending claims depend, to further clarify this point by including the term "non-pressurized" to describe the open face mold.

Independent claim 1 further recites a screed mold with "side rails" and "a honeycomb shape which establishes a mold core." Sahr and Kahn do not recite any such elements.

As such, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of claims 1-30.

The Examiner further rejects claims 1-30 as being unpatentable over Johnson (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0155385 A1) in combination with Khan. Johnson also discloses an injection molding process using a closed system under pressure. Specifically, the mold is closed using a sealant layer forming a permanent airtight chamber. Para. 40. Vacuum pressure is then applied to the airtight chamber to draw resin into the chamber. Para. 49. Claims 1 and 16, however, from which the remaining pending claims depend, recite "an open face non-pressurized mold." Therefore, the combination of Johnson and Khan does not teach all of the elements of the pending claims. Withdrawal of the §103 rejection and favorable reconsideration of claims 1-30 is requested.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. If any other fees are due, those fees should be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0581.

Respectfully submitted this 28th day of July, 2006.



Daniel P. McCarthy
Reg. No. 36,600
Parsons Behle & Latimer
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 532-1234